

Exhibit B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

IN RE: AUTOMOTIVE PARTS
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

MDL NO. 2311

STATUS CONFERENCE / MOTION HEARING

BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARIANNE O. BATTANI
United States District Judge
Theodore Levin United States Courthouse
231 West Lafayette Boulevard
Detroit, Michigan
Wednesday, February 12, 2014

12 APPEARANCES:

Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs:

DOUGLAS ABRAHAMS
KOHN, SWIFT & GRAF, P.C.
One South Broad Street, Suite 2100
Philadelphia, PA 19107
(215) 238-1700

THOMAS C. BRIGHT
GOLD, BENNET, CERA & SIDENER, L.L.P.
595 Market Street, Suite 2300
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 777-2230

**WILLIAM G. CALDES
SPECTOR, ROSEMAN, KODROFF & WILLIS, P.C.
1818 Market Street, Suite 2500
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 496-0300**

DAVID H. FINK
FINK & ASSOCIATES LAW
100 West Long Lake Road, Suite 111
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304
(248) 971-2500

1 MR. SQUERI: Your Honor, respectfully may I respond
2 to --

3 THE COURT: I didn't let him finish, but you can
4 respond for two minutes.

5 MR. SQUERI: Your Honor, the reason that I want to
6 respond to Counsel's comments is we would take strong issue
7 with the suggestion that somehow they are being kept from
8 merits discovery. Again, we provided them our DOJ production
9 16 months ago. And they -- and they are serving, we have
10 responded to interrogatories on merits issues. Their
11 document requests that they served on us that we are meeting
12 and conferring on relate to merits issues. The fact that,
13 you know, there is a stay with respect to other parts doesn't
14 change the fact that they are able to continue with the
15 discovery in this case, and they will be able to take
16 Rule 30(b) (6) depositions that are all going to be relevant
17 to the class-certification issue.

18 THE COURT: Okay. I have heard enough. Thank you.

19 MR. SQUERI: Thank you.

20 THE COURT: I mean, what it all comes down to is we
21 don't know yet what we don't know, we don't know where we are
22 going here. I have no problem with plaintiffs' proposition
23 that after the stay is lifted within 30 days you meet and
24 confer and come up with a schedule, or you come to the Court
25 and the Court will make it and it may be that it will be six

1 months from then. I'm not disagreeing with what defendants
2 propose, that the six months would be enough, but I need to
3 know more about what is happening with this discovery, and I
4 just don't know it yet. I do not have a feel for your
5 discovery. I know that plaintiffs may have eaten up the
6 12 million pages but I'm not getting anything from them about
7 what it means.

8 So, you know, I think we need to know a little bit
9 more. I do think we need to have a definite plan and
10 schedule for our class certification, I agree with that
11 wholeheartedly, I just think that we need to wait a little on
12 that schedule, but I don't think plaintiffs should take the
13 position or take the belief from me that you are going to
14 have all kinds of time now because I'm not granting exactly
15 what defendant says. I'm just saying I will wait those
16 30 days and see what you come up with, but you are not having
17 unlimited discovery, we need to move on this. So when we are
18 thinking six months, that sounds good, it may be nine months,
19 I don't know, but that's kind of what I'm thinking. I just
20 need to wait and see what that is going to be. Let's do
21 that, let's do the 30-day meet and confer. Okay. Thank you.

22 MR. HANSEL: Turning to the fourth issue, Your
23 Honor?

24 THE COURT: The amendment?

25 MR. HANSEL: The amendment and joinder of the